

Fraternally yours in the service of Jesus Christ,

PHILIP D. LE BUS.

SECRETARY CARVER'S ADDRESS TO VIRGIN ISLANDS CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include an address by Under Secretary Carver.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in 1954 when Congress enacted the Virgin Islands Organic Act, it was anticipated that from time to time it would be desirable to analyze the legislation and perhaps offer amendments. Congress recognized that eventually the Virgin Islands and its inhabitants should have a constitution into which their wishes and needs would be incorporated. In order to implement these needs the Virgin Islands Constitutional Convention convened in Charlotte Amalie on December 7, 1964. The Honorable John A. Carver, Jr., the then Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management and now Under Secretary of the Interior, attended the opening session of the convention and delivered the following address which I am pleased to present to our colleagues:

REMARKS BY JOHN A. CARVER, JR.

Mr. Chairman, what you are undertaking to do in this convention constitutes the very essence of democracy. It is, therefore, a truly thrilling experience for me to have been invited to participate in the opening of so noble an enterprise.

The right of citizens, individuals and groups, to petition their government is a cherished part of our heritage, explicitly set forth in our Constitution. Rarely, however, is it utilized in so formal and methodical a way as you have chosen to plan for your own political future.

Your action in convening this convention is the ultimate answer to those who practice tyranny at home but preach self-determination in the distant halls of international deliberation. I hope that my presence here, as a representative of the Federal Government to wish you well and to encourage the most fundamental kind of evaluation, will add one more spike in the coffin in which we bury the lie of American colonialism.

For nearly 4 years now, I have wrestled with the wide variety of problems that are committed to my office by delegation from the Secretary of the Interior. But of all the responsibilities which he has given me, that which places me in close, almost daily, contact with the offshore territories is the most satisfying. In this, all the basic elements of government are found. Each territorial entity, with its own personality, is a separate microcosm—a unique political phenomenon whose life processes can be comprehended as a unified whole, whereas in the gargantuan size and intricate workings of our Federal Establishment there is given to each department but a slice or portion. The same is true, also, in our 50 States. The situation in the territories lets us see representative government as it was at the beginning of our Republic.

You are in the very enviable position of being able to make your governmental institutions serve quite directly the needs of your community.

In one respect you are not completely free agents. Unlike the States whose sovereign existence and powers are preserved by constitutional format, the territories are peculiarly creatures of Federal discretion. In a

large sense you are direct participants in the exercise of a Federal prerogative. We are both participants in a most interesting experiment—the development of self-government by direct congressional action.

This is the real essence of the process you are initiating here this evening. You are proposing to consider the basic elements in the delicate relationship that exists between your political community and its creator, the Congress of the United States.

Traditionally, changes in the organic powers and governmental structure of the territories have emanated from the source of that power—the Federal legislative and executive institutions. But I think it particularly fitting and proper that the moving force for change originate with those most directly affected, the citizens of the territories. Through this device, the Congress can be assured that the proposed changes represent the true desires of the territory. It will be a signal to the outside world that the principle of self-government is a working force in a truly democratic system.

This occasion has something of a nostalgic quality about it for me. Nearly 4 years ago, it became my good fortune to represent the executive branch of the Federal Government at the inaugural ceremonies for Governor Palewonsky.

This was my first direct contact with any of the territories over whose affairs the Department of the Interior exercises a degree of supervision. It has, therefore, been a most interesting experience to review the remarks I made on that occasion and the developments which have occurred in the 4 years of our relationship—to see what progress we have made and whether our predictions on that optimistic day had any validity.

I said on that occasion that it was not our intention to impose administration on the Virgin Islands or any other territory whose organic legislation provided for an elected legislature chosen by free people. That declaration has been adhered to. Your Governor and your legislature have been left free to develop your own solutions to the problems that have come with maturity.

I said also at that time that "progress toward self-government will be found in the attitudes which exist in the hearts and minds of the people concerned and the manner in which that attitude is reflected in the exploitation of resources for the general good." In the context of our meeting here tonight, that statement was prophetic. For you are here convened to deliberate and to give formal expression to the attitudes which have developed in your community in the intervening 4 years of time.

In that 4-year period, under the highly competent direction of Governor Palewonsky and the responsibility and leadership of your legislature, the Virgin Islands have made monumental progress. Your educational and health programs have been upgraded to standards which were hardly imaginable in a short decade ago. The College of the Virgin Islands is a reality.

Diversification of business and industry is a fact. The virtues of the territory as a vacation spot are known throughout the mainland. Your election laws have broadened citizen participation in the governmental process. You have elected to take on the responsibilities for providing services—power and water—rather than rely on Federal management of those resources.

These are truly concrete evidences of progress and civic maturity. It is, then, wholly appropriate that you should now turn to the question of your governmental charter and the political instrumentalities through which you manage your own destinies for the future.

As in all facets of public affairs, the assumption of authority to express political aspirations carries with it a grave obligation to protect the broader national interest. As

full citizens of the United States, you must assure that the recommendations coming from this convention conform to the document which establishes the ultimate Federal sovereignty, the U.S. Constitution. More than that, in exercising the democratic prerogative of petition, you must be ever mindful of the image of America as it is seen in other quarters of the world. Every element of my experience with the Virgin Islands generates confidence that you will be responsive to these basic obligations.

Above all, we must recognize that the work of this convention will only be a beginning. Ours is not a government of whim or proclamation. You are beginning a process of communication with the basic source of Federal authority in matters of territorial government—the Congress. The role of my Department in this process cannot be a wholly neutral one, but it must be a responsible one. We shall do our utmost to make your communication to the Congress both meaningful and productive. We tender our good offices, both to make your deliberations fruitful, and to promote understanding between you and the Congress.

Four years ago, I called for "the creation of a social, economic, and political environment which will permit the residents of the area to make a free choice as to their ultimate form of relationship to the United States."

Those 4 years have established milestones of progress toward that ideal. It is now for you to express the true hopes and aspirations of this community with respect to the ultimate political question of association with the rest of the broader national community.

Bill Horton
HORTON IMMIGRATION BILL

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, along with my distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable OGDEN REID, I have introduced today a bill to tie the test of immigration to an individual's ability and ambition to contribute to the progress of America. The 11-point measure parallels the provisions of legislation I sponsored in the last Congress to revise the restrictions regulating U.S. entrance of emigrants.

Our immigration practices and policies present a serious situation wholly out of step with our country's concepts of individual values. This Nation's basic law governing who shall pass through the portals of America is now in its fifth decade—unchanged and unrealistic.

Therefore, I am proposing legislation to overhaul these outdated laws. The provisions of this measure substitute standards of skill for the present pattern of awarding admission to America based on birthplace. The proposal also gives preference to the blood relatives of American citizens so that families need no longer undergo the inhuman hardship of separation.

While this immigration bill would revise and extend the opportunity of citizenship, it would have little effect on the total number of persons allowed admission annually. The approximate doubling in new quotas would be negligible, since current quotas presently permit 155,000 immigrants annually and special legislation adds another 150,000 each year outside the official quotas.

I first offered the immigration reform legislation in May of 1964. Later last year, I testified in the bill's behalf at Judiciary Committee hearings on this and other bills proposing immigration procedure amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the following section-by-section explanation of the bill I am introducing:

1. An approximate doubling of the present 155,000 quota numbers to 300,000 annually; and the basing of future quotas upon one-sixth of 1 percent of the total number of people in the United States as determined by any future U.S. census. A quota figure thus obtained would be distributed among the various nations in proportion to actual immigration and proven desire to enter the United States between 1924 and 1964. The actual increase in those coming to the United States would be negligible as special legislation regularly admits about 150,000 per year outside the official quota numbers.

2. Unused quotas in any given year would be redistributed from countries which do not use them (the United Kingdom) to countries which need them but do not have enough quota numbers (Italy). This redistribution would be within each of four major regions: Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australasia.

3. Parents of U.S. citizens are made non-quota and would be promptly admitted. The uniting of families is important to this country and should be made a reality for many who are now tragically separated.

4. First preference would be given to those persons whose services are especially advantageous to the United States. This wording is substantially more liberal than the present law which restricts first preference to those who are needed urgently.

5. A fourth preference is established for brothers, sisters, married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, thus doubling the number of visas available to them under former provisions; and parents of resident aliens are added to the preference list. Unused numbers are made available to persons willing to work at jobs for which a shortage of willing workers exists in the United States.

6. The concept of racial or ethnic origin for Orientals is abolished. This is the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle concept. A person's nationality under this bill would be determined by the place of his birth. A person of Chinese ancestry born in Brazil would be treated as a Brazilian rather than as a Chinese for purposes of immigration.

7. Minimum quotas are doubled to 200 (this includes dependent territories).

8. Quotas are abolished for all countries and adjacent islands in North, Central, and South America. This includes both independent countries and dependent territories.

9. Second-class citizenship as between native-born and naturalized Americans is abolished. This places in legislation that principle which the Supreme Court has recently affirmed.

10. Provision is made for annual parole of refugees and escapees into the United States up to a number of 15,000—or up to any number if the President decides an emergency exists. Such refugees may be given immigration status after 2 years in numbers up to 25,000 per year.

11. Provisions for naturalizing persons who have served honorably in our Armed Forces are liberalized.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we have new immigration legislation. For far too long we have been content to permit a discriminatory and outdated law be the basis of immigration into the United States.

It is high time that the repugnant national origins quota system be abolished and provision be made for the reuniting of families and the admission into this country of persons with needed skills.

Accordingly, I am today introducing a bill in concert with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] which represents an administratively feasible, fair, and thorough reform of our present immigration laws. This bill embodies suggestions first put forward by former President Eisenhower more than 8 years ago.

It is important that these far-reaching changes be made a matter of clear and progressive law—equally applicable to all; not subject to caprice and winds of political pressure which can affect administrative judgment.

The major provisions include:

First. An approximate doubling of the present 155,000 quota numbers to 300,000 annually; and the basing of future quotas upon one-sixth of 1 percent of the total number of people in the United States as determined by any future U.S. census. A quota figure thus obtained would be distributed among the various nations in proportion to actual immigration and proven desire to enter the United States between 1924 and 1964. The actual increase in those coming to the United States would be negligible as special legislation regularly admits about 150,000 per year outside the official quota numbers.

Second. Unused quotas in any given year would be redistributed from countries which do not use them—the United Kingdom—to countries which need them but do not have enough quota numbers—Italy. This redistribution would be within each of four major regions: Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia.

Third. Parents of U.S. citizens are made nonquota and would be promptly admitted. The uniting of families is important to this country and should be made a reality for many who are now tragically separated.

Fourth. First preference would be given to those persons whose services are especially advantageous to the United States. This wording is substantially more liberal than the present law which restricts first preference to those who are needed urgently.

Fifth. A fourth preference is established for brothers, sisters, married sons, and daughters of U.S. citizens, thus doubling the number of visas available to them under former provisions; and parents of resident aliens are added to the preference list. Unused numbers are made available to persons willing to work at jobs for which a shortage of willing workers exists in the United States.

Sixth. The concept of racial or ethnic origin for Orientals is abolished. This is the so-called Asia-Pacific Triangle concept. A person's nationality under this bill would be determined by the place

of his birth. A person of Chinese ancestry born in Brazil would be treated as a Brazilian rather than as a Chinese for purposes of immigration.

Seventh. Minimum quotas are doubled to 200—this includes dependent territories.

Eighth. Quotas are abolished for all countries and adjacent islands in North, Central, and South America. This includes both independent countries and dependent territories.

Ninth. Second-class citizenship as between native-born and naturalized Americans is abolished. This places in legislation that principle which the Supreme Court has recently affirmed.

Tenth. Provision is made for annual parole of refugees and escapees into the United States up to a number of 15,000—or up to any number if the President decides an emergency exists. Such refugees may be given immigration status after 2 years in numbers up to 25,000 per year.

Eleventh. Provisions for naturalizing persons who have served honorably in our Armed Forces are liberalized.

Our immigration laws are basically 45 years out of date—and are still based on the census of 1920. We make a fetish out of the discriminatory quota system, yet the facts show we ignore it more often than we use it.

In the last 10 years, 1 million immigrants came here under quotas which would have allowed 1,500,000 to enter—which means one-third of those quotas were wasted on countries which did not use them.

In the same period 1,800,000 other immigrants came in outside the quota system or under special and temporary legislation and exceptions, such as were needed, for example, to give asylum to the gallant freedom fighters of Hungary.

That means that two out of every three immigrants during the decade came in outside the quotas.

I submit that when two-thirds of our immigrants came in outside the quota system, it is high time to change the law.

Our present immigration system discriminates flagrantly in favor of northern and western Europeans and against southern Europeans. Is there any justice in the fact that Italy, with 51 million people, has a quota of only 5,666 a year while Great Britain, with 53 million has a quota of 65,000? Is there any logical reason why Greece with 8,500,000 people is allowed only 308 immigrants per year while Sweden, with less than 7,500,000, has 3,300—10 times as many?

Nor is that the end of the unfair differences of treatment. An American who has a Swiss brother can get him admitted at once. But his neighbor, whose sister is Italian, may have to wait years to get her a quota number—under our regular immigration laws. Both are Americans and both have the American sense of fairness, and both, therefore, would be equally offended by such unequal and inequitable treatment.

Mr. Speaker, an American is a hybrid of many breeds and has the vigor of that high heritage. What began with an Italian, sailing in a Spanish ship, has seen, in our own time, an immigrant's grand-

son reach the White House—and so the grand story goes on. We are truly a Nation of immigrants. If we would honor our heritage we must put an end—here and now—to discriminatory national origins quotas, second-class citizenship, and divided families. We must have a just and equitable immigration policy as a matter of law.

EXPORT CONTROLS ON WALNUT LOGS

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of export controls on walnut logs. On Friday, February 12, 1965, the Secretary of Commerce saw fit not to extend this export control. This in itself is a unique story in a day and age of increasing Federal controls. This control was originally imposed on February 14, 1964, after all the major manufacturers of walnut veneer in the United States had made application under the Export Control Act for relief from excessive drain of the diminishing supply of walnut logs and resulting inflation in prices. But this is just not a matter of protecting an industry—it is a matter of conservation of one of America's finest furniture woods. It would be a great tragedy if we knowingly let this wood become extinct or in such short supply that its cost would be prohibitive to all except the very wealthy.

This fine wood grows only on the North American Continent and the supply could become exhausted within 7 years. The manufacturers for their part have cooperated to the utmost. They have cut the thickness of their walnut veneer to one-thirty-sixth of an inch from one-twenty-eighth of an inch. This technological change was accomplished at no small cost to the manufacturers and with no little amount of complaining from their customers.

Now the Department of Commerce has stated that the controls were lifted, because they were not 100-percent successful as a price control measure. However, the figures show that the program has been eminently successful, when measured by any yardstick of success for any similar Government-control program. The figures show that controls did decrease the export of the walnut logs, and greatly held down the domestic consumption—much below the average annual increase. This fact is even more germane, when it is noted that it took nearly 3 months of this 12-month period of control to shift to the new thickness.

This matter of walnut wood looms large in the furniture industry. The cost of walnut veneer is only 2 to 3 percent of the wholesale price of a piece of that furniture, but in 1964 \$36 million worth of walnut veneer was sold and used in approximately \$1 billion worth of furniture. It is a matter of pride to those of us from Indiana that we have 15 veneer mills that produce 70 percent of the Nation's walnut veneer.

There is another factor to be considered here. If this decision is allowed to

stand it could mean the exhaustion of the supply of this wood. This in turn would mean importing of foreign hard woods, with the resultant loss of American currency and further damage to our balance-of-payments position. There is, of course, the short range view that with this control lifted exports of this wood will increase. However, the end result would be the loss to other nations of our export market. There are other hard woods available in the world, but none that are an adequate substitute for walnut veneer.

Therefore, I request that the Secretary of Commerce suspend this decision until further hearings can be held. We have an obligation to future generations here to protect a natural resource. We have an obligation to the consumer to keep the price of walnut veneer down. We have an obligation to this group of manufacturers to see that they are not forced out of this business or to a foreign source for wood, due to a nearsighted Government policy. I request that the Secretary of Commerce therefore, give urgent reconsideration to this decision and hold a hearing on this entire matter at the earliest possible moment.

RIGHTEOUSNESS EXALTETH A NATION

(Mr. HARVEY of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on the 20th of January last at the Bristol Hotel in Beirut, Lebanon, on the occasion of a ceremony honoring the inaugural of President Johnson, a very moving address was made by Dr. Charles Malik of the faculty of the American University in Beirut, Lebanon.

The title of this address is "Righteousness Exalteth a Nation," and is as follows:

RIGHTEOUSNESS EXALTETH A NATION

(Devotional message at the Presidential prayer breakfast, on the occasion of the inauguration of Lyndon B. Johnson as President of the United States, delivered at the Bristol Hotel, Beirut, Lebanon, January 20, 1965, by Dr. Charles Malik)

America was founded on religious liberty and on faith in God. The primary motive of those who crossed the ocean three centuries ago was not economic, but religious. The economic motive came two centuries later after the religious motive had succeeded in establishing a new nation and taming and unifying a whole continent. These men and women believed in righteousness, because righteousness is nothing but conformity to the will of God. Nothing was more obvious, nothing more taken for granted in all their dealings and in all their life than that righteousness exalteth a nation, but the wicked shall fall by their wickedness. Read the literature of the 17th and 18th centuries; read Jonathan Edwards; despite the rationalist-humanist influences of the enlightenment which started streaming into the land from the middle of the 18th century and on, and which, however, providentially came in preparation for the great political constructions that were then about to dawn, the American mind lived day and night in the presence of something awesome, something invisible, some-

thing more real than anything visible; it lived in the presence of God, a living and judging God; it submitted itself to an order of being full of wonder and meaning to which it felt it must conform if it wanted to live, and woe to it if it did not conform. Perhaps the verse which stood before the American mind in those days more poignantly than any other verse in the Bible was this verse from the Psalmist: "Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows" (Psalm 45: 7). Wherever there was success and gladness, the thing was not attributed to luck or to the ordinary operations of nature; the thing was conceived as coming direct from God as the gracious reward of the righteous. There was a direct correlation, then, between happiness in this life and doing the will of God. Of course existence then was full of danger and struggle and uncertainty and suffering, but the one staying hand, the one fixed star that gave the ship of state, both of individuals, families and whole communities, steadiness and direction, peace and certainty and joy, despite all struggle and all suffering, was this living sense of God's presence and His relevance, through His law and His will, to every situation in life. How much strength and courage, how much consistency and character, how much unity of purpose and quality of life, how much ability to endure and overcome, the American Nation throughout its history has owed this original, living sense of God, is a matter that has again and again supplied pregnant themes for poet and philosopher, for saint and even for statesman.

People are worried today about the spread of atheism and cynicism, and the wave of materialism, economic determinism, and moral relativism that has swept not only across America but throughout the whole world. I am worried about these things too, and I do what I can to combat them. In fact I talked about some of them last fall on the campuses of 30 American universities and colleges. The positive response I got was beyond any previous expectation of mine. Some sophisticated people, especially on the east coast, have already given up: they speak of this as a "post-Christian" age, an age of science and technique and efficiency, an age of computers and automation, an age of what they call "creature comforts," and all this in order to justify the way they live; namely, as animals without any moral restraints or standards whatsoever. But I found the Middle West, the South, and the West relatively free of this degeneracy, relatively more pure and more wholesome; and urban life in the big cities is not representative of American character even in the East. He does not know the real America who is impressed and misled by the cheap sex literature now on display on every newsstand, by the cheap movies, and by the drinking and chambering that goes on in the great industrial communities.

We know that 80 million people went to church in the United States last Sunday. We know that the statistics of the churches indicate that 72 percent of the American people are church-affiliated. We know that one Gallup poll disclosed that 92 percent of the American people consider themselves related to a church in one way or another. Everywhere you go you find new churches building. The seminaries, I was told, are flourishing as never before. The ecumenical movement is gaining momentum, among Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox, and between them. Things are happening in this realm—such as a Catholic bishop preaching in a Protestant church and a Protestant minister taking part in a Catholic ritual—that would have appeared fantastic even 5 years ago. Until last year Union Theological Seminary never had Catholic priests among its

students; last year 2 priests enlisted and this year 16 of them are taking courses in that most famous of Protestant seminaries in America. When Karl Barth came to America 3 years ago he was a sensation everywhere he went, and he drew enormous crowds at all his appearances. Paul Tillich, who tries in his own way to make religion intelligible to the blasé intellectuals, never fails to draw large crowds, from among the young and the old alike.

Hans Küng last month drew a crowd of more than 5,000 people from all over the United States at his lecture at Georgetown University on freedom in theology. And everywhere you go you find wonderful God-fearing people: humble folk, concerned, rooted, given to prayer, doing their utmost to be faithful to their best lights; people who live their Christianity without fanfare and ostentation; who, when they pray, enter into their closet, shut the door behind them, and pray alone on their knees to their Father which is in secret, and when they give alms they never let their left hand know what their right hand is doing; people who know and love Christ and in their own way have given their lives to Him, and who believe nothing more surely than that He is the meaning of all our yearning and suffering, the cause of all our search and unrest, the hope of history and the light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world. You do not find these men in the streets or in bars or in movie houses or in wild parties; but they exist by the millions in homes and churches, in schools and factories, in universities and in government offices. Oh, I have seen hundreds of them—students, teachers, administrators, workers, mothers, humble men, happy and full of joy. When you meet them you know them and you thank God for them. And you know that it will be from their ranks, and not from the ranks of the cynics or unbelievers or morally degenerate, that God will send saviors of America in every realm and at every level.

You cannot therefore agree with those who speak of this as a "post-Christian" age and of America as having turned her back on God. What these people mean is that they wish the facts were so and, doubtless they are working to make them so. But what they do not know is that, now that Christ has come, there can never be a "post-Christian age." We shall always be living in the Christian age until the end of time. The cynics and atheists have no idea what all this means. There is in America a wonderful heaven that will certainly leave the whole lump. God is above all and He knows how to confound the wicked. "Righteousness exalteth a nation and blessed the nation whose God is the Lord." Despite every reason for discouragement and frustration, America's God at her heart is the Lord.

DOCTOR'S CARE, HOSPITALIZATION, AND MEDICINE FOR THE ELDERLY

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Herlong-Curtis bill which will provide for our elderly citizens complete medical aid when in need. This bill will make possible doctor's care, hospitalization, and medicine for those senior citizens whose income falls below a standard set by the local community and the State. This bill will provide extensive health insurance coverage for our elderly people through private enterprise. It will grant certain income tax

benefits to those purchasing adequate health insurance.

The so-called medicare bill—King-Anderson bill—will not provide full coverage for our needy elderly citizens. The Medicare bill will only provide limited benefits and increase social security taxes. The medicare bill would provide for medical attention to wealthy people and would tax our already overburdened workers further to pay the hospitalization for those in good financial condition.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing will not take from the social security program and will be no threat whatsoever to those who have paid into the social security program and who are entitled to its benefits in their elderly years. My bill will not tax our young people for 45 years in order that wealthy citizens might go to the hospital now. The Herlong-Curtis bill is a fair bill, it is reasonable and will take care of those actually in need.

Mr. Speaker, we are all acquainted with people who have paid into social security since it started in 1937 and who have not drawn a dime. It would be tragic and unfair to add social security tax burdens to these in order to send those to the hospital who are able to pay their bills while many of the needy still go unattended. We are all greatly concerned about the increasing cost of hospitalization, medicine, and domiciliary care. In a society with the highest standard of living of any country in the world, it should be of concern that many of our aged, diseased, crippled, and blind are in need of medical attention. This is an era when lifetime savings can be wiped out almost overnight when sudden illness strikes requiring prolonged hospitalization. This situation should be of concern to every thoughtful American.

Mr. Speaker, medicare—King-Anderson bill—would lead to nationalized Federal medicine, with long waiting lines, blanks, and forms to fill out, channels to go through, and with a huge Federal bureaucracy. Nationalized medicine, with its political pull and overcrowded hospitals, would only be a cruel hoax on our aging and disabled citizens who are really in need. The Congress, in considering my bill for the aged and needy must profit from the experience of England, Germany, and other countries with national socialized medicine. During the first 4 years of Sweden's national health program, absenteeism in her plants increased 25 percent. Hospitals were crowded and doctors harassed by patients with the slightest aches and pains. In Germany the average hospital stay is 29 days as compared to 8 days with similar type ailments in the United States during 1961. Doctor's strikes in Canada, Belgium, and South America caused chaos in these countries. A steady stream of doctors is leaving England annually. Socialized medicine cannot solve America's medical problems. There would not be time nor room in such a program for our aging citizens to receive the attention they deserve.

The very fact that the United States has an increasing need for more medical aid to the elderly is a tribute to the

superiority of our private enterprise medical standards. In 1900 the span of life in the United States was only 47 years—today it is 70 years.

The maternal death rate since 1915 has decreased by 94 percent. The infant mortality rate has experienced a fantastic decline.

Salk vaccine, which has played such a vital role to eliminate the threat of polio, was developed in the United States under our private enterprise system of medicine. We are on the threshold of controlling cancer and heart diseases through private research. We are making more progress than any of the nations with socialized medicine.

The dedication of our American doctors, our superb hospitals, their excellent staffs and the quality of our medical care and research with private enterprise incentive, is the best in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to enact the Curtis-Herlong bill, which will provide medical aid through a dignified, American program. My bill will extend comfort and understanding to our senior citizens in the sunset of life.

BIG SANDY FLOOD CONTROL REPORT, BIG SANDY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, KENTUCKY, WEST VIRGINIA, AND VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the need for Federal assistance to stimulate the economy of the Appalachian region of our country is one of the most pressing matters now before the Congress. The President has recommended legislation, the Senate has passed it in the form of S. 3, and this bill has been favorably reported, without amendment, by the House Committee on Public Works. The Appalachia legislation will very shortly become the pending business of the House of Representatives. I support this measure and I am confident that it will be enacted into law, although I do not think it goes far enough to come to grips with all of the problems. Possibly no district in the entire Appalachian region is more beset by economic problems and needs more help than my own Seventh District of eastern Kentucky.

I take the floor today to discuss the need for an expanded program of water resources development, as one way to help eastern Kentucky regain the economic ground it has lost over the past several decades. The "Corps of Engineers' Survey Report on Flood Control" and related water resources development on the Big Sandy River and tributaries in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, has been completed by the district engineer in Huntington and forwarded by the division engineer in Cincinnati to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, where it is now undergoing review. The people of my district have an important stake in this report. I have already brought a delegation in to meet